

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 5, 7, 8 and 10 - 12 are pending in the present application. Claims 6 and 9 are canceled by the present amendment, and claims 10 - 12 are newly added.

Applicants amended FIG. 4 to correctly designate the cavity end mirror with reference numeral 40.

Applicants amended the specification to consistently designate (a) the laser medium with reference numeral 10, and (b) the cavity end mirror with reference numeral 40. Applicants also corrected several errors with regard to English usage.

Applicants amended claims 1 and 2 to delete recitals that appear in claims 7 and 8, respectively. Applicants canceled claims 6 and 9 because their recitals appear in claims 1 and 3, respectively.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1 - 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants amended claims 1 and 7 to address the issues raised in the Office Action. Claim 9 is canceled. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 112 rejection are respectfully requested.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,282,215 to Zorabedian et al. (hereinafter “the Zorabedian et al. patent”), and on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 2 and 4 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Zorabedian et al. patent. Thus, all of claims 1 – 9 are rejected as either being anticipated by or being unpatentable over the Zorabedian et al. patent. Of the rejected claims, only one claim is independent, namely claim 1. Applicants amended claim 1 to recite a feature that is neither described nor suggested by the Zorabedian et al. patent.

Claim 1 provides for a laser source. The laser source includes, *inter alia*, a cavity end mirror, wherein the cavity end mirror is curved. This feature is described in the specification, for example, at page 3, lines 24 – 26, and page 8, lines 20 – 23.

The Office Action suggests that the cavity end mirror of claim 1 is described by the Zorabedian et al. patent's disclosure of a retroreflector 122. Applicants have not found any description or suggestion in the Zorabedian et al. patent that retroreflector 122 can be configured as a curved mirror. As such, the Zorabedian et al. patent neither describes nor suggests a cavity end mirror, wherein the cavity end mirror is curved, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is both novel and patentable over the Zorabedian et al. patent.

Claims 2 – 5, 7 and 8 depend from claim 1. Thus, claims 2 – 5, 7 and 8 are also novel and patentable over the Zorabedian et al. patent. Claims 6 and 9 are canceled.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 102(e) rejection of claims 1 and 3, and the section 103(a) rejection of claims 2 and 4 - 9.

Applicants added claims 10 - 12 to further provide the claim coverage that Applicants appear to deserve based on the art cited in the Office Action. A favorable consideration that also results in the allowance of claims 10 - 12 is earnestly solicited.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul D. Greeley, Esq.

Reg. No. 31,019

Attorney for the Applicants

Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.

One Landmark Square, 10th Floor

Stamford, CT 06901-2682

Tel: 203-327-4500

Fax: 203-327-6401

10-23-03
Date